

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 and 13 have been amended Claims 1-30 are pending. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

1. Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-12, 14-26, and 28-30 provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-12, 14-26, and 28-30, respectively, of copending Application No. 09951750.

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is drawn to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112.

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Neil Weste, et al. "Principles of CMOS VLSI Design: A System Perspective," Second Edition, 1993, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company (Weste).

2. Response to Double Patenting

Because the double patenting rejection of claims 1-12, 14-26, and 28-30 in view of a co-pending U.S. patent application No. 09/951750 is provisional, Applicants submit that when a co-pending U.S. patent application No. 09/951750 matures into a patent, and if claims 1-12, 14-26, and 28-30 are still conflicting, Applicants will file a Terminal Disclaimer at that time.

3. Response to § 101 Rejections

It is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 15, 23, and their respective dependent claims are drawn to statutory subject matter.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a computer-implemented method, and therefore may not be characterized as “simply manipulating abstract ideas.” Thus, pursuant to MPEP 2106 .R-2, the method of claim 1 is not non-statutory. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims be withdrawn.

Claim 15 is directed at an apparatus comprising a plurality of components (e.g., an integrated circuit and a test network) and therefore comprises statutory subject matter. It is respectfully requested that Examiner cite the requirement (e.g., in MPEP) directing Applicants *to recite* a result produced by a claimed apparatus. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 15 and its dependent claims be withdrawn.

Claim 23 is directed at an apparatus comprising a test network having particular electrical characteristics. Thus, claim 23 and its dependent claims are directed at statutory subject matter. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 23 and its dependent claims be withdrawn.

4. Response to § 112 Rejections

Claim 13 has been amended to address the rejection. It is requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

5. Response to § 102 Rejections

Claim 1 recites the feature of “determining a test network having electrical characteristics such that the electrical characteristics of the interconnection are approximated by the electrical characteristics of the test network within a specified tolerance.” The Office Action recites a passage in Weste to show this element. Specifically, the Office Action cites the opening paragraph of the “Distributed RC effects” section of Chapter 4, entitled “Circuit Characterization and Performance Estimation.” (Weste, page 199, paragraph 1.)

The abovementioned paragraph states that “[f]or very long wires with appreciable sheet resistance propagation delays caused by distributed resistance capacitance (RC) in the wiring layer can dominate.” However, Weste does not mention either “a test network” or an operation of “determining a test network having electrical characteristics such that the electrical characteristics of the interconnection are approximated by the electrical characteristics of the test network within a specified tolerance.”

Because not each and every element of claim 1 is disclosed in Weste, claim 1 and its dependent claims are patentable in view of Weste and should be allowed.

Claim 15 recites “a test network electrically coupling the driver and the receiver such that an input/output interface interconnection may be emulated therewith.” As discussed above, Weste does not mention “a test network” in general or “a test network electrically coupling the driver and the receiver such that an input/output interface interconnection may be emulated therewith” in particular.

Because not each and every element of claim 15 is disclosed in Weste, claim 15 and its dependent claims are patentable in view of Weste and should be allowed.

Claim 23 recites “a test network for an input/output interface having elements selected such that electrical characteristics of the test network approximate electrical characteristics of an input/output interface interconnection within a specified tolerance.” As discussed above, Weste does not disclose this feature.

Because not each and every element of claim 23 is disclosed in Weste, claim 23 and its dependent claims are patentable in view of Weste and should be allowed.

6. **Conclusion**

Having tendered the above remarks and amended the claims as indicated herein, Applicants respectfully submit that all rejections have been addressed and that the claims are now in a condition for allowance, which is earnestly solicited.

If there are any additional fees due in connection with this communication, please charge our deposit account no. 02-2666. If a telephone interview would in any way expedite the prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact Elena Dreszer at (408) 720-8300.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: _____, 2006

Elena B. Dreszer
Reg. No. 55,128

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300